

Application No.: 10/823,320  
Docket No.: UC0422USNA

### Remarks

#### Status of the Application

Claims 1-3 and 9-18 are pending. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 10 and 11 are allowable, and have taken the opportunity to rewrite Claim 10 in independent form in a previous amendment.

Claims 4 and 5 are withdrawn. Claims 6-8 are canceled. Claim 1 is amended to advance the prosecution by more particularly reciting the general formulae of the non-polymeric fluorinated organic acids. The amendment is supported in the disclosure at page 8, lines 9-18 and page 4, lines 16-24.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Masahiro, JP 2003-040856 ("Masahiro"). Claim 1 is amended to include general formulae for each of fluoroamido organic acids, fluoroamidoether organic acids, and fluoroether organic acids. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment overcomes Masahiro at least for the reason that the formula of the claimed fluoroamido organic acids differs substantially from the formula disclosed in Masahiro, and further, because Masahiro does not disclose or suggest fluoramidoether or fluoroether organic acids, or combinations of the three acids specified in amended claim 1. Accordingly, there can be no anticipation of the amended claim, and therefore, its dependent claims are also patentable over Masahiro.

Claims 1-3, 9, and 12-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Nakama et al., US 5,126,017 ("Nakama"). Nakama discloses polymerizations using fluoroalkyl surfactants. Exemplary surfactants are listed in Nakama at Col. 2, line 65 to Col. 3, line 8. None of these read on the fluorinated non-polymeric organic acids of claim 1. These surfactants are also listed in claim 4, while dopant electrolytes are listed in claim 5 of Nakama. Accordingly, there can be no anticipation of the claims in light of amended claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that both anticipation rejections have been overcome by the foregoing claim amendment.

Application No.: 10/823,320

Docket No.: UC0422USNA

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the Masahiro publication. As discussed above, Masahiro does not teach or suggest the acids recited in amended claim 1. The acids of the instant claims contain ether, amidoether and/or amido groups and non-aromatic backbones which are not found in the acids disclosed in Masahito. Due to the significantly different chemical structure of the acids recited in the instant claims and those disclosed in Masahito, one skilled in the art would not find the choice of such acids obvious from a review of the reference. Moreover, the acids disclosed in Masahito are selected for their ability to aid in electrolytic polymerization of a film *in situ* and not to prepare a compound that is capable of forming a stable film. Thus, in regard to claims 15-18, it would not have been obvious to make a device comprising the composition of claim 1. For at least this reason, the claims are not obvious in view of Masahito. In Masahito, the acids shown are used to form precipitates which are then applied as a dopant in electrolytic processes (see, e.g., paragraph [0025] and paragraph [0029] and the Examples on pages 5-6). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 was also rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nakama. The surfactants in Nakama, which vary considerably in their chemical structure from those of amended claim 1, are used mainly to facilitate electrolytic polymerization *in situ* (on an electrode), where the dopant electrolytes are small molecule metal complexes (e.g., FeCl<sub>3</sub>) or inorganic acids (e.g., HCl and H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>). By contrast, the present disclosure in Examples 2 – 7 shows that the compositions as claimed are produced by chemical polymerization and that such polymerization produces stable dispersions of conducting polymer and the fluorinated non-polymeric acids.

Accordingly, none of claims 15 – 18 are obvious over either Masahiro or Nakama. Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion


Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections should be withdrawn and that claims 4 and 5 be considered as depending from an allowable generic claim. Applicants further respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicit a

Application No.: 10/823,320

Docket No.: UC0422USNA

notice of allowance for Claims 1-5 and 9-18. Should the Examiner have questions about the application or the contents of this paper, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



John H. Lamming

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No.: 34,857

Telephone: (302) 992-5877

Facsimile: (302) 892-1026

Dated: September 4, 2007